



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## IV. — A Word Miscellany

BY PROFESSOR EDWIN W. FAY

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

## I. PLANTS AND A PLANT-CHARM

i. Skr. *ōṣa-dhi-s* = brenn-pflanze

1. THE explanation of the Petersburg lexicon (*PW*.<sup>1</sup>) from *avasa-dhi-* 'nahrungenthaltend' is not inappropriate semantically, and aptly fits not less than a dozen instances in the *Rig Veda*. In several dozen places the reference is to green or growing plants, or to vegetation in general. In a few of these the plants are personified, not to say deified, as in 10, 97, addressed to plants of medicinal application, simples (cf. dialectic *yarbs* = herbs), as dried (? cf. *babhrī-* 'brown' in stz. 1) and stored up by the physician (stz. 6). But allusion to the medicinal use is otherwise rare (cf. 6, 52, 6; 10, 145, 1).

2. More than a dozen instances remain that describe the plants as fire-containers, the source of fire, and this justifies the inquiry whether in the compound *ōṣa-* does not mean 'fire.' Then *-dhi-*, cognate with *dhāyas-* 'nutriens,' is the second member, perhaps (cf. *Aen.* 1, 176, where *nutrimenta* = *fōmes* [*fō(y) : dhē(y) ?*] 'kindling'). But instead of 'igni-nutriens,' I think rather of *ōṣa-dhi-s* as 'brenn-pflanze,' comparing *-dhi-* with Lat. *fē-tus* (of vegetable growths) and *fēnum* 'hay' (?), to the root *dhē(y)* 'nutrire' (cf. Lat. *fē-lix* and its kin). Here also belong Skr. *dhā-nyā-m* 'frumentum,' *ἀκρο-θί-νια* 'first-fruits,' and *θά-μνος* 'bush' (morphologically like *στά-μνος*). In *θά-λος* (n.) as perhaps in *fē-lix*, the *l* has become a determinative, while the *ā* of *τέθαλα* (: *θάλλω*) is due to a secondary gradation.

3. I foresee stumbling here touching the general sense, 'plant,' but I plead Ger. *reis* 'twig,' which, by a quite reasonable and even convincing definition, means 'quod tremit,' equally descriptive of 'twig' or 'bush,' but *reis* further means 'fagot.' With *ōṣa-dhi-s* I suppose the reverse, that 'fagot' was generalized to 'brush.' The nomenclature is even sim-

pler: hay, dry leaves, twigs, fagots will all have been used for kindling (*fō-mes*), and collectively called *ōṣa-dhi-s*, 'brennpflanze.' No wonder if the same name was applied to these materials undried and uncut. He who made the identification *brushes are fagots* would have no difficulty in shifting subject and predicate to *fagots are brushes* (i.e. brennpflanzen sind pflanzen).

### ii. Lat. *ver-bena*

4. If *θάμνος* and *fē-num* (§ 2) have been correctly derived from the root *dhē(y)*- 'nutrire,' we have good reason for treating *ver-bēna* as a compound, either = 'door-plant' (*ver*: Umbr. *vero*-), or better, 'mountain-plant,' quasi 'arciherba' (*ver*: Skr. *giri-s*, Av. *gairi-š* 'mons'). Further cognates of *ver*- 'peak, spitze' are Lat. *veru* 'spit,' *veretrum* 'mentula' (see *AJP.* 31, 417). This explanation of *ver-bena* fadges precisely with Pliny, *N.H.* 22, 5: *sagmina in remediis publicis fuere et in sacris legationibusque verbenae. certe utroque nomine idem significatur, hoc est gramen ex arce cum sua terra evolsum.* If we can credit Pliny with knowing his facts, *ver*- = 'arx' and *ver-bena* = 'arci-herba.'

5. As for *verber* 'whip' (sg. masc.), which is rare (cf. Neue, *Formenl.*<sup>3</sup> I, 712), its cognate is Skr. *vārdhra-s* 'strip of leather' (: *vardhana-m* 'abschneiden'). Plautus has only *verbera* (n. plur.; cf. *locus*: *loca*) and an abl. of secondary formation, *verberibus*. The Plautine hapax *subverbustus* is a momentaneous analogical formation (*onera*: *onustus* :: *verbera*: *-verbustus*), cf. *Aul.* 409, 414, *ita me miserum et meos discipulos fustibus male contuderunt . . . itaque omnis exegit foras, me atque hos, onustos fustibus.*

### iii. Latin *fetiales*; *sagmina*

5a. The *fetiales*, in their mission of making truces and treaties, carried a flint or flints (*silices*) wherewith to slay the sacrificial swine, but they also carried, and this seems the more characteristic of their office, *verbenae* or *sagmina*, as in Livy, 1, 24, 5, *fetialis arce graminis herbam puram attulit* (cf. also 30, 43, 9). This makes it possible to regard *fetialis* as a

derivation of *fetus* 'plant' (§ 2), or even, as an archaic religious word, to look upon it as a compound of *fet*<sup>o</sup>/<sub>u</sub>- 'plant' + \**yak-s-lis* 'iaciens': Av. *yax-š-tiš* 'twig' [cf. for the idea 'vitem ex se eicere' in Varro, and Fr. *jeter*, Span. *echar* (from Lat. (*e*)*iectare*) 'to send out shoots']. How did the fetials employ the *sagmina* which they bore? On one occasion, before starting on their mission, by touching a member of their group, to designate him as *pater patratus* (Livy, I, 24, 6), but it is also reported (Marcian. *Dig.* I, I, 8, 1) that wearing the *sagmina* was a sign of their ambassadorial character. But from Livy, I, 24, 8, supplemented by Paulus-Festus, 82, 8 (cf. also Polybius, 3, 25), we learn that the flint with which the swine had been slaughtered was subsequently cast away with an imprecation that Jupiter would so strike with a flint (his thunderbolt?) the fetial, if guilty of conscious perjury. Was a similar disposition made of the *sagmina*, attended by an imprecation so "to weed out" (§ 6) the fetial, if guilty of perjury, from his native land? We know so few details of fetial procedure that, inasmuch as Latin literature has preserved only in Paul the Deacon, abridging Festus, the tradition of the casting away of the *silex*, it is not all too rash to suppose such an unreported casting away of the *sagmina* also by the *fet-ialis* (= ? 'plant-caster'). Finally, if the *sagmina* were used as garlands by the *fetiales*, or used to bind the swine for sacrifice (see on Skr. *badhnâti*, (§ 19), the definition 'withies, bands' is apt. This admits of deriving *s-agmina* from *s(w)*- 'co-' (§ 14, fn.) + a cognate of *ἄρνος* 'withy' (§ 39).

#### iv. Latin *āverruncat*

6. This religious terminus technicus [in the form *auencat*; cf. also *adtruncat* 'avertit, alienat'] is significantly glossed by 'eradicat, eruncat.' I derive the word from the phrase *ā ver(e) runcare* = 'ab arce runcare' ('to weed'), cf. in general the Umbrian rite of *urbis lustratio* (see Buecheler, *Umbrica*, 42 seq.). The rooting up of *gramina* from the *arx* (see § 4, Pliny, *l.c.*) to carry into the enemies' country was a symbolic petition "to weed from the land" (§ 5 a), unless the phrase "to

weed from the door" grew up in private life, with *ver-* : *vero-* 'porta.' An instructive parallel is furnished by Shakespeare's usage of 'to weed.'

#### A. Of Calamities and Adversaries

7. Cato, *agr.* 141, 2 (in an *agri lustratio*), Mars pater — calamitates prohibeas defendas averruncesque; Gell. 5, 12, 14, in . . . diis quos placari oportet, ubi mala a nobis vel a frugibus natis amoliantur, Auruncus<sup>1</sup> (Varro, *ling. lat.* 7, 102 has *Averruncus*) habetur; Livy, 10, 23, 1, prodigia — quorum averruncandorum causa; Pacuvius, trag. 236, possum ego istam capite cladem averruncassere; cf. 2 *Hen. VI.* i, 3, 102, So, one by one, will weed them (= enemies) all at last; *Rich. III.* i, 3, 123, a weeder-out of his adversaries; *Rich. II.* ii, 3, 167, the caterpillars of the commonwealth, Which I had sworn to weed.

#### B. Of Feelings

8. *Cor.* iv, 5, 108, Each word thou hast spoken has weeded from my heart A root of ancient envy; Fulg. *serm. antiq.*, 51, averruncassit deus tam aricinas (= testas vel argilleas) hominum mentes (*Thes.*, 2, 636, 24); Pacuvius, trag. 112, di monerint meliora atque amentiam averruncassint tuam (= Lucil. 541, verbo 'atque' omisso — proverbial in Arnobius, Ambrosius, cited ap. *Thes.*, ib., 1316, 57 sq.); Livy, 8, 6, 11, placuit averruncandae deum irae victimas caedi; *L. L. Lost*, v, 2, 857, weed this wormwood from your fruitful brain; *T. G. Verona*, iii, 2, 49, but say this weed her love for Valentine, It follows not that she will love Sir Thurio.

#### C

9. In *Meas. for Meas.* iii, 2, 284, twice treble shame on Angelo, To weed my vice and let his grow, 'to weed' is used most generally for 'to drive out, drive off, expel,' yet in a context that leaves the literal meaning perfectly clear. In Latin, *averruncare* exhibits nowhere a context quite so literal — nor a meaning more generalized.

#### II. SKR. *çû-nyâ-s* 'EMPTY,' AV. *sû-ra-* 'HOLE, LACUNA,' LAT. *cuniculum* 'BURROW'

10. I derive *çû-nyâ-s* from a root *kêw-* 'fodere, caedere,' and find it a formation generally comparable with *εἶνυς* 'orbis' : *êw-*. Cf. the regular participial formation in *çû-na-m* 'emptiness, inopia.' A further cognate in *çû-la-s* 'spit,

<sup>1</sup> In *Au-runcus* I see the *au-* of *ausugio*, *aufero* : the derivation from *A-verro* (Buecheler-Usener, in the latter's *Götternamen*, 9) 'off-sweeper' is very complicated.

stake.' In the long run, *kēw-* will hardly be kept apart from *kōw-*, the root of Germ. *hauen*.<sup>1</sup> The variation of guttural may be ascribed to some proethnic influence upon *kōw-* of the roots to which Skr. *ṣāsati* 'caedit' or *ṣākḥā* 'branch, bough' belong. My personal point of view, however, about the variation *k̄/k* is, in general, like Hirt's (*BB.* 24, 290, 11; cf. Brugmann, *Gr.* 2<sup>2</sup>, 1, p. 474), and I specifically assume a guttural articulation, when group-homogeneity did not interrupt, to conform to the vocalic environment; cf. the tripartite Greek treatment of *k<sup>w</sup>* (see *CR.* 13, 398).

11. Cognate with *sū-ra-* and *ṣūnyá-s* is Lat. *cūnīculus* (? with *ū* shortened before the accent, see Fay, *IF.* 26, 32 sq.) 'cony' = 'hole-dweller.' It may be that the cony was introduced from Spain, as Varro, *r. r.* 3, 12, 6, asserted, but that does not prove that a Latin name was not given to the cony, while *cunīculum* 'little hole,' early employed of siege-mines, may be prior to *cuniculus* 'cony.'

### III. AVESTAN *āda* 'DIXIT'

12. The equation of Av. *āda* with Skr. *āha* (see, e.g., Bartholomae, *Witbch.* 55) is effected by positing an Indo-Iranian root *adh-*, in further support whereof *āttha* (Brāh.) = 'ais' has been pleaded. This evidence, as Wackernagel (*ai. Gram.* 1, § 217, a, fn.) has shown ("āttha mid. Ind. from \*āktha"), is not conclusive. Further, the Av. *ḍ* may be explained in several ways as secondary. 1° Assuming a root *aḡh-* (proto-Ir. *ažh-*), its Persian form would be *ad-*, leaving us to ascribe Av. *āda* to dialectic admixture. 2° Or we may derive the conjugation stem *ādaya-*, in *paiti. ādayoiṭ* 'respondeat' from *ā-* + *dhaya-*: the root *dhē(y)*-<sup>2</sup> 'τιθέvai,' cf. *niḍayeinte* 'deponuntur,' *niḍayaṭ* (act. form, cf. Lat. *fit*) 'deponitur' (see Bartholomae,

<sup>1</sup> This is of course the root to which Lat. *cavus* 'hollow' belongs (Fay, *Stud. honor of B. L. Gildersleeve*, 202 sq.); cf. for the vocalism *κῶος* 'lair' and *κῶα* 'ἐνέχυρα, i.e. 'cautiones.'

<sup>2</sup> The following evidence for *dhē(y)* rather than *dhē* is offered: stem *dhey-ye-* in *θελω*; stem *dhay-ye-* in Skr. *dhīyāte* 'fit'; *dhey-(y)e-* or *dhay-(y)e-* in Lat. *au-dio*, *con-dio*; stem *dhi-ye-* in *ἐσθλω*; cf. the stem *d(h)ay-* in Av. *vi-dīzā-* 'generosity:' the "root" *dā-*.

*Gr. Ir. Phil.* 1, p. 83, 11). For the sense as a verb of saying, cf. Skr. *abhi + dhlā* 'narrare,' Av. *paiti. dā* 'nuntiare' (jurid.), and Lat. *ēdit* 'narrat, nuntiat.'<sup>1</sup> This *ādaya-*, alongside of \**āsa-* (: Skr. *āha*), would account for the deflection of \**āsa* 'dixit' to *āda*. 3° Or \**āsa* was deflected to *āda*<sup>2</sup> under the influence of *gaḍa-* 'rogare,' *vada-* 'dicere, recitare.'

13. If the evidence of *āda* and *āttha* does not, upon examination, yield proof of Ind.-Ir. *adh-*, the Hesychian gloss ἡχάμεν· εἶπεν just as little proves a root *aḡh-* (see Solmsen, *KZ.* 39, 219, who fails to mention, in justification of ἡχάμεν· εἶπεν, Lat. *hiscere* 'loqui'). But the root *aḡh-* does suit ἀχέειν (*Hym. Hom. Dem.* 479, wilfully emended to χάειν) and Lat. *adagium, aio*, (*prodigium*<sup>3</sup>) unless, as Solmsen contends, their root was *ag-*. Cf. *gratias agere* = 'danksagen' (Lattmann, *Woch. kl. Phil.* 1910, p. 899). The phonetics comes out right if we assume the flexion *agyo agyes agyet*, etc., whence *aio agis agit*, etc.; also see § 32.

<sup>1</sup> If the "root" *ēdo-* 'accipere' (: *ēdei* 'eats') can be regarded as a compound of *ē + do* (cf. Brugmann, ap. Prellwitz, s.v. *ēdō*, and note the schwa-vowel in the Orphic word *ὠμαδῖος = ὠμωστής*; also in the analysis of Lat. *hērēd-*, Skr. *dāyā-dā-s* the recognition of *ēd-* as 'accipiens,' *Kvg.* § 370): Skr. *ā + dā-*, we might suppose that Lat. *ēde* (impv.), with an original sense *quasi* 'heresetze,' passed to something like 'depone' (tutis auribus, in rimosa aure, Horace), whence at last 'narra.' Thus *ēde-* (not from \**exde-*): Av. *ādaya-* is an admissible comparison.

<sup>2</sup> As for the physiological contact, note how Germans, unaccustomed to our English *ā*-sound, turn *either* into *eizer*.

<sup>3</sup> But not *indigetare*, which I would explain after Klaussen (ap. Roscher, *Lex.* p. 136, 3) as 'digitis invocare.' Ambrosch (*ib.* 155, 52) does well to start with Macrobius *Sat.* 1, 17, 15, *virgines vestales ita indigitant, Apollo Medice, Apollo Paean*; and Steuding's depreciation of this passage (*ib.* 167, 45) is quite unjustified. No matter if Apollo's name was omitted in the Pompilian Indigitamenta (*ib.* 153, 19), who shall say that in some part of their liturgy the Vestals did not tell off his attributes with their fingers, as on a rosary? The Indigitamenta were liturgical formulae, containing names and prayers — why names and not prayers? why prayers and not names? why a thousand attempts, beyond the reach of all evidence, at exclusive classifications? — but the redaction of these in writing to secure preservation does not imply that there were not earlier or simpler groupings, told off on the fingers to secure a proper number of repetitions — as in the case of the triple text of the Arval Song — or a proper count of the groups, for the Roman gods were grouped. Formally, *indigētes* is a deverbative, after some crude thought process like this, viz.: if *homines locuplētare = h. locuplētēs facere*, then *deos indigētare = deos indigētes (facere)*. Further, cf. the verbs in *-itare* formed on *dives, caespēs, sospes* (Juno Sospita), *hospes, miles, veles*.

14. Nothing conclusive can be cited for either form, but *aġh-* (*agh-*) has beside it the rhyme root *swāġh-* 'vocare, sonare' (see cognates ap. Prellwitz, *s.v.* ἡχή), attested by Lith. *svagė'ti* 'sonare;' and *sw-āgh-*, as *āxó* (cf. Ark. *fāxos*, nom. prop.) by its sense of 'echo' suggests, is a compound of *sw-* 'co-' (: O Bulg. *sŭ-* 'co-') + *āgh-* 'loqui.' Thus *āxó* is 'quae col-loquitur.' That the simplex should mean 'loqui,' while *sw-āġh-* means 'sonare, exclamare' need cause no stumbling, for *λάσκει* (: loquitur) unites all three senses.<sup>1</sup>

#### IV. THE ROOTS *nēġh-/nēk-* 'VINCIRE; FIGERE'

15. *Formal postulates and assumptions*: 1° That the palatal *ġh* may vary in this root with the plain guttural *gh* (see Hirt, ap. § 10); — 2° That, in addition to the more normal gradation stages there was a "metathetic" stage, *enġh-*<sup>2</sup> (? with *e-* as in ἔθελω, § 36), which might by loss of aspiration yield *enġ-* (Brugmann, *Kvg.*, § 261, 6), whence, by retroaction, *neġ-* beside *neġh*; — 3° That the parallel root *ēġh-* 'vincire' (v. Walde, *s.v.* *ango*; Fick-Stokes, pp. 14–15, *s.vv.* *ango* and *oktos*) arose from the composition of orthotone verb forms (Brugmann, *l.s.c.*, § 42, 4, c) of *neġh-* with the preverb *en-*, accentually reduced to *n̄*. Thus *āνωγα* 'iniunxi' (§ 32), from *n̄-nōg-m̄*, was misdivided *n̄n-ōg-m̄*, like Eng. *an adder* for *a nadder* (see § 34); — 4° That initial *ə* in Sanskrit, or even in the primitive speech, yielded *a* (cf. Pedersen, *KZ.* 36, 85).

16. As attests for the root *nēġh-/nēġh*, *ēġh-/ēġh-* I first

<sup>1</sup> I suspect a good many other roots with initial *sw-/w-/s-* of being compounds of *su-* 'with;' see e.g. on Skr. *sv-djate* (§ 16, 4°) 'com-pletitur,' and cf. my analysis (*AJP.* 31, 419) of *sw-eks-[s]thos* '6th' as 'co-ex-stans.' Note also Skr. *sv-apiti* 'sōpit,' from *su-* + the root of Lat. *apere* 'ligare' (cf. *somno* (re-)vinctus, Ennius, *Livy*; *sopor* *completitur artus*, *Aen.*; Oft in the stilly night | Ere slumber's chain hath bound me, Tom Moore). The "prosthetic" (?) *v-* of Skr. *v-dñcati* 'swerves': *dñcati* 'bends' may be a (merely) intensive use of *s[w-* 'co-' in composition (cf. Lat. *con-*; and on O Bulg. *su-v-azā* 'copulum,' § 16, 2°). In fine, *sw-ādu-* 'sweet,' in Lat. *suā[d]v-is*, may be a compound of *su-* 'good' + *ādu-* : *edit*, with a secondary *ā* to match schwa-forms, like the *a* of *ωμάδιος* (see § 12, fn.; and note that according to § 15, 4° initial *ə*- tended to *a* in the primitive speech).

<sup>2</sup> I take it for granted that every reader knows that the nasals before (? after) gutturals are homorganic, and it seems to me a needless pedantry to indicate that fact by diacritic marks.



present a brief table consisting in part of words to be subsequently studied in more detail. 1°, Grade *n)ōgh-/n)ōg-*:—*νωχελής* ('vincitus' whence) 'piger' (v. Fay, *AJP.* 21, 198; cf. O Bulg. *v-εzēti* 'haerere,' W Russ. *vyaž* 'swamp' = "worin man stecken bleibt"), Skr. *sām anāha* 'co-(i)niunxi,' Av. *āxšti-š*<sup>1</sup> 'pax, foedus,' *āxšta* 'compacta, pacata.'—2°, Grade *negh-/enēgh-*:—Skr. *nāhyati* 'nectit' (v. § 18), *νέξας*· *τὰ στρώματα*, O Bulg. *v-εzati* 'vincire,' *aza/v-aza* 'vinculum,' cf. *su-v-aza*, which probably reveals the source of the prosthetic *v-* (v. Brugmann, *Gr.*<sup>2</sup> 1, 495, anm. 1), which may have been proethnic, i.e. *v-aza* from [*s*] *w-onēgh-* (§ 14, fn.).—3°, Grade *enēgh-/enēg-*: Lat. *angit* 'schnürt zusammen,' *anguis* (: *enēgh-w-is*) 'constrictor,' *ἄγγελος*,<sup>2</sup> originally 'attaché,' with the same amelioration of sense found in Fr. *ambassadeur*: Gallic *ambactus* 'servus.'—4°, Grade *eġ(h)-/og(h)-/uġ(h)-*:—Av. *ašta- ašti-š* 'nuntius;' *axti-š* 'leiden, schmerz, krankheit,' *ažana-* 'krankheit,' Lat. *egestas* 'paupertas;' *ὄχανον* (unless from *soġh-*<sup>3</sup>) 'band,' *ὄχμα*· *πόρπημα*, *ὄχλος* 'multitudo' (cf. Eng. *band* = troop)—unless: Skr. *sāhas-* 'vis' (cf. *sahās-ra-m* 'multitudo').<sup>4</sup> Here I put *ἔχis* 'snake' (rather from *egh-* than from *eġh-*, as Av. *aži-š* [with *ž*, not *z*] seems to show) and *ὄφis*, the latter from *oġhwi-s* (see § 31), cf. *anguis* from *enēgh-wi-s*. From the grade *eġ-/neġ-* Osc. *egmo* 'negotium': Lat. *neg-ōtium*. From *eg-* (or *uġ*?) Skr. *sv-aj-ate com-plectitur* (on *s(w)-* = *co-* see § 14, fn.): Lith. *seg iù* 'fibulo.'—5°, Grade *s)na<sup>x</sup>-g-*:—Skr. *nāga-s* 'snake,' *pan-naga-s*<sup>5</sup> snake (lit. 'foot-binding'): Eng. *snake*.

<sup>1</sup> Here and elsewhere in this list forms from *neġ-* are indistinguishable from forms belonging to *negh-*.

<sup>2</sup> Lith. *algis* 'angelus summorum deorum' began by meaning something like 'Dienstboten': (*algū* 'Lohn') and does not belong here.

<sup>3</sup> It seems to be taken for granted that all the forms connectible with *ēxw* come from a single root. Without now going into details I note that, though many of the forms properly and simply derive from *seġh-* 'potiri,' others admirably suit the root *eġh-* 'vincire,' cf. for the sense *apere* 'to bind': *apisci* 'to obtain.' Cf. with movable *s(w)-* (§ 14, fn.). O Ir. *sén* 'snare' from *seġno-* (Fick-Stokes, p. 297): O Bulg. *su-v-q-za*.

<sup>4</sup> The verb *ὀχλεῖν* admits of the definition 'to tug' (i.e. 'pull along with a band, use a tug')—as *μοχλεῖν* means 'to use a lever.'

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Gadow's *Amphibia and Reptiles*, p. 614, where it is remarked of the

17. There seems no good reason for doubting that the root *s)nēgh-* 'vincire' is the extension of the root *snē-* 'vincire, nēre' by a determinative (cf. *νᾱ-χεῖς* = Lat. *nā-s*): cf. also *nē-dh-* in Lat. *nōdus* : *νή-θω* 'I spin.' So, alongside of *s)nēgh-* I would put the root *nēk̃* 'nectere,' for which I cite — 6°, Grade *nēk̃-/ēnēk̃-/ənēk̃-*: — Goth. *nēhw<sup>1</sup>/nēhwa* 'prope' (i.e. 'iuxta,' but cf. *ligatus* = 'adjoining' and *necessitas angusta* 'near relationship'), *ἀναγκαῖοι* = *necessarii* (i.e. 'coniuncti'), cf. O Bulg. *qžika* (: *enēgh-*) 'consanguineus'; *ἀν-δγκη* 'constraint, torture' (see § 42), *necesse* (loc. plur. in *-es-si*) = 'in bonds'<sup>2</sup> (Fay, *TAPA*. 37, 9 sq.), O Ir. *écen* 'necessitas' *écess* 'poeta' (i.e. 'qui pangit'), cf. (Perso-?)Skr. *bandin-* 'poeta' from 'binder,' Gr. *ῥαψῳδός*, Lat. *vincta oratio* = 'poetry.'

18. Minute regard solely to the testimony of Skr. *ndhyati* 'nectit' made Wackernagel (*ai. Gram.* 1, 217, a, anm.) decide that it was derived from a "root" *neēgh-*, and not from a root *nedh-*. In the Slavic languages, O Bulg. *nīza* 'infigo,' *pronoziti* 'perfodere' also attest a root *neēgh-* 'figere,' cf. Slavic *enz-* 'vincire,' cognates of which are cited in § 16, 2°. Are these different roots? And if the same root, which sense is the earlier? Let us define quite concretely by 'to tie' and 'to peg,' and ask whether homophonous roots with these meanings constitute in reality but a single root. My answer will be that they do, and a sufficient reason for my answer is that another root indubitably attests both meanings, and this is the root of *πάσσαλος* 'a peg,' on the one hand, but Skr. *ῥάξ-* 'a lace, tie,' on the other. The Latinist, studying *pango*, *paco*, and their kin would say that the original sense was 'figo,' but the Indo-Iranian scholar, confronted with isolated

American black snake: "It does not twine itself around the legs, *as is commonly supposed*."

<sup>1</sup> With *w* a samdhi-form of *u*, the deictic locative (v. Brugmann, *Gr.* 2<sup>2</sup>, 1, p. 248). There is no kinship between *nēhw* and *ἐγγύς* (pace Hirt, *Abl.* § 635), which is a compound and means 'at hand' (Fay, *AJP.* 31, 416), cf. also *μεσηγύς(s)*, with *-γύ* by irradiation from *ἐγγύς*, unless 'mid-hand' was the original sense.

<sup>2</sup> The construction 'mihi necesse est de me ipso dicere' is substantially identical with *ὁμῖν ἐν ἀνάγκῃ ἐστὶ βουλευσασθαι περὶ αὐτοῦ* (Lysias, *κατ' Ἀνδοκ.* 8), see § 43 and fn.

*páç-* *pāça-s* 'vinculum' and the moribund Avestan root *pas-* 'vincire,' must decide for 'necto.'

19. The obvious solution of the difficulty is to say that the root *pēk-/pek-<sup>1</sup>/pāk-* meant 'to fasten,' and that *πάσσαλος* on the one hand and Skr. *paç-* on the other have developed from it. As I personally think, some concrete noun like 'peg' or 'tie' started the "root" on its way. But this aside, the root seems to have meant "to tie" rather than "to peg," and that on the evidence of Skr. *paç-* Av. *pas-*; — not because Sanskrit and Avestan emerge as literatures so long before Latin, say, but because of the isolation of *paç-* already mentioned, and ultimately because stone hatchets were lashed to their handles long before boring tools developed to the point of allowing them also to be pegged on. But we must not forget that the process of lashing a stone axe to its handle involved grooving or splitting the handle, and that the axe itself was 'pegged' into the handle; nor that a verb, especially a denominative, describing the process of 'helving' was liable to be allocated to one or more of the several ideas of 'splitting, lashing, pegging' (see Meringer, *Woch. kl. Phil.*, 1910, 565–566). Further note the generalization whereby Lat. *immolare* grew to mean 'sacrificare,' and Skr. *badhnāti* 'binds' grew to mean 'offert, caedit.' Thus Lat. *victima* (and Germ. *weißen*) may be cognate with *vincit* 'binds.' Cf. Lat. *sacer* : *sancit* '\*binds' *TAPA*. 37, 15.

20. It was doubtless in technical usage that the vague 'to fasten' replaced the graphic 'to tie.' The brickmason "ties" <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The *ě*-vocalism is proved by Goth. *ga-fēh-aba* 'apte,' and particularly, for me, by Lat. *pecus*, originally of animals *tied up* for domestication (cf. Lith. *bandà* 'pecus,' and Aratus, ap. Cic. *N.D.* 2, 159, *vinctum domitumque iuvenum* [§ 48a]), and so *δαμάζει* 'domesticates': *δῶμος* ('the wattled') house' attests. — For this sense of Skr. *pāçu-* see Grassmann, *Wb. z. RV.*, s.v.; and of *δῶμος*, Walde, s.v. *domus*. I am fresh from a rural summer where the family milch-cow was always kept tied by the family cabin (in Texas called "staking"). In local usage (U.S.) *tie-up* is the name of that part of a barn used for cow-stalls. The original sense of *-δῶμος* lingers on in the Aeschylean compound *λεπτοδόμοις* (*πέλισμασι*) 'fine-plaited (cables),' as well as in *δῶμοι* (Herod.) of layers of brick (cf. *tie-course*, § 20).

<sup>2</sup> German brickburners similarly employ *schnur* to designate "reihe von ziegeln, wie sie in den brennofen gesetzt wird."

his wall after a certain number of lengthwise courses by a crosswise course, and the carpenter uses 'tie-beams' and 'tie-bolts.' For the same metaphor in Greek and Latin, cf. Thuc. 2, 75, σύνδεσμος ἦν . . . τὰ ξύλα; Caes. B. C. 2, 10, 3, tigna . . . laminis *clavisque religant*; *ib.* 2, 6, 2, ferreis manibus iniectis navem *religarant*.

21. The reverse development from 'figere' to 'nectere' is harder to substantiate, for Fr. *attacher* [: Eng. *tack*, as explained by Diez and Littré (Skeat and Kluge)] seems more likely, on the whole, to be cognate with *tactus*. But Eng. *tack* has Germanic cognates, e.g., E Fries. *tak* 'twig, bough,' that look toward the sense of 'nectere.' However, the development from 'tine, prong, branch' (of antlers) to 'branch' (of a tree) is too obvious to let us believe that 'nectere' was the original sense; cf. Lat. *clavula* 'scion, graft' (originally 'little tine, peg'), *clavicula* 'tendril.'<sup>1</sup>

21a. The generalization of the concrete toward the abstract is possibly attested, also, by Eng. *clench*/*clinch*. True, the Oxford Dictionary gives as the original definition "to make to stick firmly together, to rivet," but the derivation from the onomatopoetic "root" of *clink* seems to me certain — save for the large number of etymologists who are genuinely pained at the thought of reaching back to the phonic germ of a word. But when we say 'to *clinch* a rivet,' i.e. to make it *clink* in the act of bradding its head, I seem to myself to see the word in its swaddling clothes. Nor is this to overlook the older Germanic forms ["*klankjan*], *chlankhan*, *klenken*, *chlenkan* = conserere, knüpfen, binden, schlingen" (Schade), but I think the current English locution "to clench (clinch) a knot" (cf. *clinch* = knot in a rope, nautical) may go back far enough in Germanic history to account for the development of a general sense like 'knüpfen.' We cannot date metaphors con-

<sup>1</sup> Be it remarked in passing that *tack*, Ger. *Zacke*, belong with δάκνει 'bites,' orig. = 'tooth,' perhaps. So Skr. *daçā* 'fringe' may be a metaphor from the "fringe" of the teeth — unless from a string of teeth worn as a primitive necklace; cf. Fr. *dentelle* and *point* = 'lace.' Gr. δοκός '\*tooth' was applied, I surmise, to projecting rafter ends, as in the wooden construction whence proceeded the Doric temple, with its "triglyphs"; and δοκός 'rafter' came by synecdoche from δοκός '\*tooth.'

clusively, but if the sense of Eng. *knop/knob* is more original than the sense of Germ. *knüpfen*, by the same token Eng. *clinch* = 'knot' (a metaphor from the rivet) may be prior in sense to OHG. *chlanckhan* 'conserere.' It is a question of passing from 'pegged' to 'tied,' as Aeschylus did in *Prom.* 113, *δεσμοῖς* (πε)πασσαλευμένος. Indeed, throughout the *Prometheus* there is confusion of 'nailing' and 'binding;' cf. also γόμφοι· δεσμά, σύνδεσμος.

22. With this evidence before us, O Bulg. *nizq* 'figo' and Skr. *náhyati* 'nectit' may be referred to a root *neǵh-* 'nectere; figere,' with the likelihood that, on the whole, 'figere' developed out of 'nectere.'

23. A grade *neg-* is further found in the Sanskrit tautological complex *yu-naj-mi* 'iungo' (see Fay, *AJP.* 26, 399).<sup>1</sup> I am prepared for the objection that *yu-náj-mi* has a derivative *yugá-m*, with a *g* not deducible from *-naj-*, but a fixed constituent of the root. Let us shift the analysis to Skr. *pi-mç-áti* 'pingit' (on which see the last footnote), compounded of *pi-* 'point' + *n(e)k-* (: *neǵh-*), and ask what is the relation of *pi-k-* (in *πικρός*): *pinek-* in *pi-mç-áti*. The relation is a mere accident, perhaps, for *πικρός* may have got its *kr* by irradiation from the *kr* found in Lat. *acer* 'sour;' in a word, the "root" *s)pry-* 'point' has got a *k* from *ǵk-* 'point' (in Lat.

<sup>1</sup> I am not unaware of the frigidity with which this attempt to explain the nasal verb flexion from tautological compounds, or complexes, has been received, but of its general reasonableness I am more convinced as I study the nasal verbs further. Let us apply it, for instance, to the three Latin verbs *pangit*, *pingit*, *pungit* = 'fastens, paints, pricks.' To begin with *pu-ng-it*, a weak-grade root *pu-* 'tundere' is hardly to be questioned (cf. Walde, s.vv. *puteus putus*), which, combined with *negh-* 'figere,' yields the proper sense for *pu-ng-it*. As for *pi-ng-it*, a stem *s)pi-/s)pi-* 'pointed' is quite certain (cf. Walde, s.v. *pinna*), and the interpretation of *pi-ng-it* (with *ng*: *neǵh-*) as 'point-pricks' (i.e. 'tattoos,' see Fay, *AJP.* 21, 198) is perfectly apt. As for *pa-ng-it*, we may start either with *s)pē(y)-* (: Lat. *spi-na*), or with *pō(w)-* (: Lat. *puvit/pavit* 'strikes'), reduced to *s)p-* (cf. *σπάθη* 'striker') and combined with *neǵh-*. — I must add in frankness that personally I regard *s)pēy-* and *s)pōw-* as correlatives (see *AJP.* 26, 188, § 25). But whether my resolution of the phonetic difficulty be adjudged correct or not (see op. cit. 25, 371, d), parallel forms with *i/u* alternation present a problem for solution, as e.g. Skr. *leṣṭu-s/lostā-s* 'clod.' O Eng. *lytel*: Goth *leitils*, *στίφος* 'mass': *στίφει* 'masses' (cf. the bases *l̥y-/l̥w-peik-/peuk-ǵh̥y-/ǵh̥ew-* in Walde, s.vv. *luo pugil faux*; and in general Noreen, *Urgerm. Laull.* § 22).

*acus* 'needle'). For *yug-*, if I believed in the unlimited algebric treatment of the gradation series, I might speak of *yu-* + the reduced grade of *eg(h)* 'iungere' (§ 16, 4°), but I prefer rather to say that upon some proethnic derivative of the root of Skr. *yáuti* 'iungit,' let us say p. ptc. \**yŷ-tó-s*, the influence of some derivative of *ĕg(h)*, let us say *ăktó-s* (cf. Av. *āχšta*, § 16, 1°) made itself felt, whence *yŷ(k)tó-s* — and that before the subsequent parasitic differentiation of palatal from pure guttural was established (§ 15, 1°).

24. For the root-stage *nēk-* as many as three separate roots have been set up, defined as (1) 'adipisci' (cf. Lat. *nac-tus*), (2) 'necare' (cf. *nocet*), (3) 'vincire' (in Lat. *nec-t-it* [if not from *ne-ĝh-t-it*], *necessitas*, § 17). That all these meanings belong to one root only is for me beyond question. By simply assuming the use of a 'trag-riemen' (v. *TAPA*. 37, 9), designated by a noun *nēk-* 'strap,' I showed how to unite (1) and (3). But we would also come out for (2), e.g. if *νεκ-ρός* = ('morte') *vinctus*.'

25. But we come out more simply even by positing a noun *nēk-* 'snare,' used by a hunting and trapping folk, whence (1) 'to snare game' (cf. Cicero, *N.D.* 2, 161, *feras nanciscimur* venando)—the 'snare' being liable to use also as a 'trag-riemen;' (2) 'to strangle with a snare, kill;' (3) 'to bind with a snare, fasten.' Other meanings, as in *νακτός* 'compact, solid,' come from binding with a string, i.e. 'pressing.' About *πήγνυμι* and its sept (see §§ 18, 19) the general sense of 'solidify' has grown up. Observe also the very strict, if limited, sense of 'compression' in the sentence 'Miss Blank *laces*.'

## V. DERIVATIVES OF THE ROOT *nēĝh-/ĕgh-*

### i. Lat. *anguis* : *ἔχis*, *ὄφis*

25a. The later standard authorities deny the relation of *anguis* to *ἔχis* and *ὄφis*, though Walde presents a curiously complicated scheme whereby the words have become intertangled. But if the root was *nēĝh-*, with the various grades exhibited above (§ 16), and with alternation of palatal and

guttural (§ 15, 1°), the difficulties as to the nasal (§ 15, 3°) and the vowels disappear. There is still a difficulty as to the guttural, for  $\chi$  on the face of it is either a pure guttural or a palatal—certainly a palatal if  $\epsilon\chi\iota\varsigma$  and  $\epsilon\chi\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$  ‘hedgehog’ are cognate (see § 28)—while *anguis* and  $\delta\phi\iota\varsigma$  seem to show a velar. Skr. *ahī-s* and Av. *aži-š* make either for a velar or a pure guttural, while Arm. *iž* is said to represent—unless it is a borrowed word (cf. Scheftelowitz, *BB.* 28, 291)— $\bar{e}g^{w}hi$ - or  $\bar{e}ghi$ -.

25*b*. We save trouble of course by equating  $\delta\phi\iota\varsigma$  = Skr. *ahī-s* = Av. *aži-š* : Arm. *iž*. But we also make trouble. We lose the etymology of these words, because we cannot thus trace their derivation. We do not get the etymology of Lat. *domus* by saying it equals  $\delta\acute{o}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ , we only get its etymology when we account for the meaning ‘house’ (§ 19, fn. 1).

26. To my mind Lat. *anguis* properly means ‘constrictor,’ and belongs with *angit* ‘binds’ (so Fick-Stokes, p. 15). I also follow Fick (1<sup>4</sup>, 504) in deriving Lat. *natrix*, Germ. *natter*, from the root *sṃnē-* ‘nere’ (cf. above, § 16, 5°, on Eng. *snake*. Skr. *pan-naga-s* : *snē-g-*). In his translation of *AV.* 10, 4, 10; 15, etc. Professor Whitney rendered *svajā-* (i.e. *sv-ajā-*, see § 16, 4°) by ‘constrictor.’

27. There are two different ways in which the sense of ‘constrictor’ may have developed, (1) from the snake’s own coils, cf. Lat. *nodi* and *nexus*, ultimately cognate with the root of *snake* and of *anguis*, both meaning ‘coils;’ *convolvens* and *tortus*, both describing the snake’s coiling motions;  $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omega\nu$  . . .  $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\sigma\sigma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$   $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$   $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\eta$  (X 95)<sup>1</sup>; (2) from its coils about its prey. Nor is it necessary to have in mind the giant Pythons as Grassmann (*Wtbch. z. RV.* s.v. *ahī-s*) did, for many of the smaller snakes constrict their prey, to be-

<sup>1</sup> Shakespearean examples: *As You Like It*, iv, 3, 109, About his neck | A . . . snake had *wreathed* itself; *rolled* = coiled, *z Hen. VI*, iii, 1, 228, *T. And.* ii, 3, 13; cf. *ib.* ii, 3, 35, Even as the adder when she doth *unroll* | To do some fatal execution, cf. Vergil, *G.* 3, 423, cum medii *nexus* extremaeque agmina caudae | *solvuntur*, tardosque trahit sinus ultimus orbis, etc. Certain tree snakes “let themselves fall down from considerable heights, *coiling* body and tail like a watch spring, and alighting on the ground upon the *spiral*, which breaks the fall” (Gadow, op. cit. p. 619).

numb the living creatures before swallowing them.<sup>1</sup> It is not impossible that the snake, the constrictor, was named before the verb came to mean 'to bind' — conceived, that is, as a 'thong' or 'lash,' before the verb took on the sense of 'nectere.' But whether that be true or no, the following words, to say nothing of the Furies' snaky hair, reveal a few of the objects likened to snakes: *anguilla* (= 'eel'), glossed by "est quâ coercentur in scholis pueri, quae vulgo *scutica* dicitur" (cf. Eng. 'whip-snake'); *an(guilla)* genus *flagelli*; Skr. *māla-dhāna*-, said to be the name of a snake, is attested as the name of a sort of 'schlingpflanze'<sup>2</sup> (*māla* - : *mālā* 'wreath'). The rope-like shape of the snake gives point to the proverb in Petronius' 'colubra *restem* non parit.'<sup>3</sup> The Italian snake called *bova* (*boa*) by Pliny — for which the original sense was, I surmise, merely 'leather strap,' cf. *βοεύς*, Skr. *gāvas* (see § 52, fn.) and Plautine *boves* (*Asin.* 34) = 'straps of cowhide' — has given a name to a rope-like piece of woman's neckwear. Last I note *σκυτάλλη*, a name applied to rod-like snakes, which suggests Moses and Aaron and the snake-turning rods of the Egyptian conjurers.

28. So much by way of illustration of the notandum 'quae se nectit.' The cognation of *ἔχis* with *ἐχίνοσ*, if granted, seems to demand a very different notandum, viz.: "der stechende" (so Prellwitz), and no reader of Shakespeare would question "stinging" as an epithet for *snake*. But it may be shown, I think, that 'convolvens' is not only an apt description of the *hedgehog*, but that, among the Greeks and Romans, it was the description, *par excellence*. Let us begin with the proverb, cited from Archilochus (118), and probably the earliest mention of the *hedgehog* in a European litera-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gadow, op. cit. p. 605, "The prey (a lizard or mouse) is caught by the head and further secured by several *turns* of the body of the captor, whose tail is then turned forwards, round the head of the victim, so as to form a kind of *knot*;" also pp. 613, 616, 621, et al.

<sup>2</sup> Here note Germ. *schlange* which, generally explained as "die schleicherin," may perhaps mean 'quae se flectit': OHG. *slingan* 'flechten.' — The garter-snake seems to have been named from his color.

<sup>3</sup> Is *colubra* a cognate of *cōlum*, glossed by *σχοινιον* = 'restis'? Cf. the gloss *colus* 'virga quae per cocleam volvitur.'



ture: πολλ' οἷδ' ἀλώπηξ, ἀλλ' ἐχῖνος ἐν μέγα, echoed by Ion, ap. Athen. 3, 91, E, ἀλλ' ἐν τε χέρσφι τὰς λέοντος ἦνεσα | ἢ τὰς ἐχίνου μάλλον οἰζυρὰς τέχνας. What this trick was is clear from Pliny, *N.H.* 8, 133, *irenacii* . . . *volutati* supra . . . poma . . . ubi vero sensere venantem . . . *convolvuntur* in formam pilae, ne quid comprehendi possit praeter aculeos. Cf. Nemes. 57, *implicitumque sinu* spinosi corporis *erem*. Thus we see that 'coiling' is as suitable an epithet for the *hedgehog* as for the *snake*.<sup>1</sup>

29. The phonetic result from the comparison ἔχis : ἐχῖνος is the establishment of *egh-* as one root form, beside which a plain guttural stage *egh-* is admissible without more ado (§ 15, 1). But does *anguis* show a third variety, a labialized velar? I am decidedly of the conviction that it does not, but that we have to start with *angh-w-is*. The stem *angh-w-* is nothing but the stem of Skr. *amhú-* (in *amhu-bhēda* 'engspaltig') used as a basis for further suffixation, cf. *angh-wo-*, attested in Lat. *angi-portus*, though this may represent *anghli-* 'direct,' and is not so likely to represent *angh-u-* 'direct' (pace Brugmann, *Gr.* 2<sup>2</sup>, 1, p. 177). Gothic *aggwus* is contaminated from *\*aggu-z* and *\*aggwaz* (see Zupitza, ap. Brugmann, *ib.* 1<sup>2</sup>, p. 928, fn.). Lat. *anguis* is but a feminine (cf. Skr. *pūrī-s* fem. to *pūrī-s* 'πολύς'; πολλο- from πολ[*f*]-γφ-) to the stem *anghú-*.

30. I note in passing that all Lat. *u*-adjectives have become *-vi*-adjectives, starting with the feminine, but the extension of nominal *u*-stems by *yo*-stems, to indicate adjective function, was common (Brugmann, *ib.* § 115, b). In the German adjective flexion we have suppletion of *u*-stems from the *jā*-stems, and this also has been charged to the feminine forms. The contamination, if that is the right word, of *i*- and *u*-stems seems also indicated in the Sanskrit *āu* locatives to *i*-stems, cf. Oscan acc. in *-im* to *u*-stems, e.g. *manī-m* 'manum,' even if *castrid* (ablv.) be the continuant of *\*castrūd*. The co-existence of *ti*- and *tu*-stems must also be reckoned with, how-

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to note the association of these two animals in an incantation in *MND.* ii, 2, 9: You spotted snakes, with double tongue, | thorny hedgehogs, be not seen.

ever minimized by von Planta (*Gram.* 2, p. 162), who fails to note that *senati* (gen. from dat. loc. of an *i*-stem?) greatly outnumbers *senatus* in earlier Latin. The locatives *humū* (Varro, *Men.* 422, 531) and *humī* may also attest *u*- and *i*-stems (cf. Skr. *ksāmi*-, fem. 'humus,' but on all these *i*-forms felt as locatives we must allow for the influence of *domi*). But *humī* = χαμ-αί is a perfect equation.

31. This startform for *angui-s* the 'she-narrow-one' is, *exceptis excipendis*, valid (1) for Lith. *angi-s*, for which it is more expedient to write the base with pure guttural, *angh-w-is*, though this assumes that *-nghw-* has the treatment of *-ng<sup>u</sup>h-*; and (2) for ὄφης which, in its only Homeric occurrence (and again in Hipponax), must be read as ὄφφης or ὄπφης, and that in a line where the metre would have admitted, in another position, ὄφης (see Schulze, *Quaest. Ep.* 431). For the Homeric ὄφφης (ὄπφης) I write a base, derived from the root *eḡh-* or *egh-*, *oḡhwi-s*, assuming for *ḡhw* a treatment analogous to the treatment of *k̄w* in ἵππος, cf. κέπφος as explained by Brugmann in the *Grundriss* (1<sup>2</sup>, § 342). The general Greek simplification of ὄφφης (ὄπφης) to ὄφης seems to be an early instance of what occurred at a later date to the proper names Βάκχος/Βάχχος and Σαπφώ/Σαφφώ, viz. their reduction to Βάχος and Σάφω (see Miss Dawes, *Greek Asp.*, p. 13).<sup>1</sup> It is hardly necessary to add that Methymnian ἱμβηρίς· ἔγγελος attests a stem *engw-* as Lat. *anguilla* attests *ang(h)w-*.<sup>2</sup>

## ii. Homeric ἄνωγα 'iubeo'

32. Solmsen (see § 13) derived support for his root *ag-* 'loqui' from ἄνωγα. Granting his definition even, γ might be secondary in a nasal environment (§ 15, 2°; cf. Skr. *v-ag-nú-s* 'cry': *szw-āgh-* in ἡχώ, § 14 fn.). I would, however, define ἄνωγα by 'iniunxi' (cf. Eng. *enjoins* = 'orders')<sup>3</sup> and identify

<sup>1</sup> The early poetical form *δκχος* beside *δχος* presents difficulties, but here we have a merely mechanical analogy *φόκχος/φόχος*, modelled on the intensive doubling in (f)l(f)ακχῆ, beside (f)l(f)αχῆ.

<sup>2</sup> I can but believe that in the gloss *ἄβεις· ἔχεις* we have our Latin verb *habet*.

<sup>3</sup> So Lat. *iubeo* looks like the combination of the root *yu-* in Skr. *yāuti/yuvditi* ('bindet an') with the root *dhē-*. Skr. *yuj-*, in the simplex, reached the sense

it with that other fossilized form, Skr. *anāha* (= *co-(i)niunxi*; see § 38). Phonetically the correlation of *h* and *γ* may be the same correlation presented in Skr. *ahām* = *ἐγώ*, unless ultimately due to the alternation *ngh/ng*; and so we may account for the *g* in Lat. *agere* = 'dicere,' § 13.

33. The difficulties raised as to the tense of *ἄνωγα* (Solmsen,<sup>1</sup> l.s.c.; Leo Meyer, *Hdbch.* 1, 197) are due to misconceptions, as an analysis of the instances reveals:<sup>2</sup> (1) All the cases of *ἄνωγα-ς* (2d sg.) are anaphoric, *i.e.* refer to past injunctions, and 'iussisti' would be a valid rendering in every case.<sup>3</sup> (2) The clausula *σε φράζεσθαι ἄνωγα* (5 times) always concludes a brief speech of warning, and so far as time relations go 'te cavere iussi (admonui)' is always (less so at π 312) admissible. (3) In π 405, 446, υ 364 (*ἄνωγα*) and in Ξ 105, P 582, Ω 90 (*ἄνωγεν*) a perfect rendering is well justified; especially note I 680, where Odysseus, reporting back from Achilles, combines *ἄνωγεν* (Lang-Leaf-Myers render by 'biddeth') with *ἠπειλήσεν* (*ιβ.* 'threateneth'). (4) In (ἐ)με θυμὸς ἄνωγεν, Z 444, Ξ 195 [= Σ 426, ε 89], Σ 90, Ω 198 [*μένος καὶ θυμὸς ἄνωγεν*, cf. Lat. *mens animi*] the rendering 'my heart hath bound (enjoined) me' has yielded the inferential sense 'my heart bids (prompts)'; in σ 409 *ἄνωγε* is for 'iusserit' (fut. pf.). (5) In K 120, Ψ 345, γ 317 (*κέλομαι καὶ ἄνωγα*), π 316 the present sense seems to me very strong,

'auftragen, befehlen, iniungere.' Cf. Eng. *clench/clinch* (§ 21) = 'affirm emphatically or conclusively; insist;' Lat. *defigit* 'declares fixedly, firmly.'

<sup>1</sup> Solmsen's list of present-perfects of verbs of saying is not truly illustrative, for all save *γέγωνα*, inferential perfect, with curious shift of meaning (cf. *novi* 'I have learnt, know,' and *οἶδα* 'I have seen, know'), to *γυγνώσκω* (?), are emotional reduplications of vigorously descriptive and concrete verbs, *e.g.* *κέ-κλήγ-α* 'I (have) bawl(ed)', or rather, 'I bawl-and-bawl.'

<sup>2</sup> I have examined only the cases listed in Gehring's index as perfects, taking it for granted that the 15 impf. uses of *ἄνωγε(ν)* are really preterites, and constituted the bridge from *ἄνωγε(ν)*, pr. pf., to *ἄνωγει*, pr. Naturally I have not followed Solmsen in treating *ἀποτρύνω καὶ ἄνωγα* as a standing formula, for the unmolested text always reads *ἀποτρύνει καὶ ἀνώγει*, nor is *κέλομαι καὶ ἄνωγα* (§ 33, 5) a standing formula.

<sup>3</sup> Ω 670, where *ἄνωγας* = 'iusseris' (fut. pf.), constitutes no real exception; nor in σ 346 does the tense of *ἰσχανάς* require the couplet verb *ἄνωγας* to be present.

but as, in the *θυμὸς ἄνωγεν* locution, 'bids' has so naturally arisen from 'hath bound,' the reason for the extension is plain enough.<sup>1</sup>

34. Far be it from me, however, not to admit that *ἄνωγε*, especially as in *θυμὸς ἄνωγεν*, may have started with the sense of ('co-)egit,' but the equation *ἄνωγα* = Skr. *anāha* (§ 32) seems to me to have stronger claims. The proethnic start form was *ḡ-nōgh-m̃* (see § 15, 3°), an *en*-compound, subsequently, misdivided *ḡn-ōgh-m̃*, whence the conception of a root *ēgh-*, attested by Arm. *iž* 'snake' (§ 25*a*), by Skr. *sām anāha* (§ 38) and by Av. *ny-āzata* 'sie schnürt, *ny-āzayen* 'iniungant, infigant' (referred by Bartholomae — *Wtbch.* p. 362; *IF.* 8, 235 — to the root of *ἄρχει*). For further evidence of a long initial vowel, cf. Av. *āršta* (§ 37).

### iii. ἐνήνοχε and ἥνεγκε<sup>2</sup>

35. I have before now suggested that these words came from the (kindred if not) common roots *nēgh-* and *nēk-* (*TAPA.* 37, 11) and pointed out incidentally that in pairs like ἐνήνοχε and ἥνεγκε, proceeding from correlated roots where tenuis and media aspirata were found, we had the source of the aspirated perfects in Greek.

36. These roots I would now, for systematic purposes, write as *enēgh-* *enēk-*, but the question arises whether the initial *e-*, here and in all the *enek-* *ewek-* bases (Hirt, *Ablaut*, § 562 sq.) is not the (prepositional) element found in *ἐ-θελω* (cf. Brugmann, *Kvg.* § 593, anm.); and then another question arises, whether these roots are not compounds with the preposition *en*, viz. *en-ēgh-* and *en-ēk-*, proethnically welded, as in *ἐπ-ίσταμαι* *ἐπ-* is ethnically welded to its root. Thus considered *ἥν-εγκ-ον* is like *ἥπ-ιστάμην* and *-ην-οχ-ε* comparable with *ἥν-εγκ-ε*, supposing *ἐν-ήν-οχ-ε* to be unoriginal, due to recomposition with *ἐν-* or to a secondary Greek reduplication. But the division *ἥ-νεγκ-ε* is far surer, with *-νεγκ-* a reduplicated aorist stem of the *ἐ-πε-φν-ε* type, cf. Lat. *na-nc-iscor*,

<sup>1</sup> Further note Shakespeare's *Ant. and Cleop.* i, 1, 38, I *bind* | On pain of punishment the world to weet (= know), — where *bind* differs little from *bid*.

<sup>2</sup> For the development of meaning, see §§ 24, 25.

with *a* for *e* from *nactus* (i.e. *nāḱ-tós* : *nēḱ-*). I similarly divide Skr. *ā-nānṣ-a*/*ā-nāṣ-a*, taking *ā-* for an augment of the prosthetic (prepositional) *e-*. But in the perfect *ān-añj-a* the sense *in-unxi* favors the notion that *ān-*, if not merely analogical, is an augmented preverb *en-*.<sup>1</sup>

iv. Av. *āxštay-* 'pax, foedus,' *āxsta* 'pacata,' *āgrā-mati-š* 'coniuncti-mens'

37. These words (with inorganic *x*) would seem to belong to the root laid down in *PW*.<sup>1</sup> (I, 567) as *ah-* (" : *nah* : : *aḡ* : *naḡ*"); further references, § 15, 3°. Note *ἀγχώνη* 'noose.' From 'noosing' came the senses of 'hanging' and of 'constriction' (§ 25), cf. Γ 371, *ἀγχε-μν-ίμας-ἰπὸ δειρήν*. With *ἀγχυ* 'prope' cf. *iuxta* and *strictim*. The primary sense of *ἀγχυ* was 'schnürt' (cf. Grimm's *Wtbch.*, s.v. *schnüren*, p. 1407, 1, c : "funiculo torquere . . . schnüren heisst auch pendere, brancher, henken, mit dem stricke umbringen").

38. The meaning of the Skr. root *ah-* is, in spite of considerable ellipsis, perfectly transparent in *RV*. 8, 48, 5<sup>b</sup>, *ráthaṁ ná gāvaḥ sám anāha párvāsu* = 'ut currum (*i.e.* currus articulos) lora <co(i)niungunt, ita ego> *co-(i)niunxi* <vini latices> articulis <meis><sup>2</sup> (= articulos meos vino).'

39. I interpret the *ā* of *anāha* as attesting a long vowel root *n)ēḡh-*, also found in Av. *ny-āzata*, but see Bartholomae as cited in § 34. For the root-grade *ēg(h)*- cf. Av. *āgrā-matay-* quasi 'coniuncti-mens,' and for *ag-*, *ἄγνος* 'vitex'<sup>3</sup> (cf. *H. Hom. Merc.* 409 *καρπερὰ δεσμὰ | ἄγνου*) and *ἄγ-λ-ἰθος* 'cluster or head of garlic' (perhaps a chain of garlic-heads), assimilated

<sup>1</sup> The *ān-* reduplication of Sanskrit roots in *r*, e.g. *ān-rcús* 'laudaverunt,' if not exhibiting *n* dissimulated from *r* in reduplicated groups, may likewise show *en-* welded in composition; cf. Lat. *inquam*, and for the fact of suppletion of a simplex by a compound with *en-* recall that Lat. *in-cipio* is the present of *coeipi*.

<sup>2</sup> For the metaphor cf. on the one hand colloquial *tanglefoot*, for whiskey; and on the other a *bracer*, colloquially used for a drink or toddy, but defined by Johnson as a 'medicine which gives tension or tone to any part of the body.'

<sup>3</sup> For the vocalism cf. O Bulg. *j-agnēdū* 'pōpulus' (Liden, *IF*. 18, 506). As the *ἄγνος* supplied withies for binding so the *αἴγλειπος* (populus nigra = *j-agnēndū*) furnished the Homeric wheelwright (Δ 482) with felloes (*ελτρυς* = 'binding,' *i.e.* 'rim': Lat. *vitex* 'withy'). See further on *j-agnēdū* in § 55.

to γελ-γῖθες in ending. The vocalism of our root, sans nasal, is shown in Gallic *Octodurus* (cf. Fick-Stokes, p. 15).

v. Av. *ašta-*, *ašti-š-* 'nuntius,' *axti-š-* 'angor,' Lat. *egestas*

40. For the development of sense in *ašta-*, morphologically identical with Gallic *octo-*, see on ἄγγελος (§ 16, 3°), further noting Skr. *yuktá-s* 'angestellt,' *nī-yukta-s* 'angestellter, beamter.' With pure guttural, *kt*, not *k̂t*, Av. *axti-š* 'angor.' For Lat. *egestas* 'angustiae, paupertas,' cf. *pauperies angusta*, *res angusta*, which does not seriously differ from *res egenae* (Plautus, *Cpt.* 405; *Poen.* 130; Vergil, *Aen.* 6. 91 [wherein Norden, in his *Aeneis*, vi, p. 361, conjectures an Ennian reminiscence]) I posit a stem *eg(h)es-*. The sense of *eget* is clearly related with the sense of Av. *ažah-* 'bedrängniss, noth.'

vi. Oscan *egmo*, Lat. *negōtium*(?)

41. For Osc. *egmo* 'res' (four times in the Lex Bantia, once combined with *toutico* 'publica') the rendering *negōtium* is everywhere appropriate. It would seem that *egmo* was in these instances the 'chose in action,' a sense development as in Germ. *ding*<sup>1</sup> (see Kluge, s.v.), Eng. *thing*. Also cf. Eng. *fixtures* 'articles of a personal nature,' and colloquial *traps*, of one's 'belongings, possessions, things.' The original sense of *egmo* may have been 'pactum': *ēg(h)-* 'nectere.' Is *negotium* — also used of a law-suit, and curiously amenable in its lexical citations to the rendering of 'engagement' — a parallel form from *neġ(h)-*? This surmise requires a ptc. \**negotus* of one 'bound to his work,' cf. Eng. 'to bind an apprentice' — whence *negotium* = '\*negoti opus.'<sup>2</sup>

vii. Irish *écen* 'necessitas': ἀνάγκη, Lat. *necesse*

42. The morphological and semantic aspects of Prellwitz's derivation — "*ananġ- : enġ : neġ*;  $\sqrt{neġo}$  tragen" — are entirely insufficient. A careful examination of ἀνάγκη in

<sup>1</sup> Was it not from legal *causa* that Fr. *chose*, etc., developed?

<sup>2</sup> Here note the gloss *nagat* (unless for *uagat*) 'vacillat, huc illuc flectitur,' cf. Eng. *bends*, derived from *band* : *bind*.

Homer should bring the conviction that, like Lat. *sedulo* (*sedulus*, *sedulitas*) and (*se curâ*) *sēcurus* (*sēcuritas*), ἀνάγκη is a conflux derived from ἐν \*ἄγκη. For the vowel assimilation whereby ἀν- has replaced ἐν, I not only compare λακάνη for λεκάνη, but I apply the principle established by J. Schmidt (*KZ.* 38, 5 sq.) that prepositions enclitically prefixed to their regimen suffer peculiar and relatively extended reduction. It is possible, however, to look upon ἀν- as a proethnic reduction of *en-* in composition (§ 34).

43. The Homeric usage of ἀνάγκη admits of the following classification: (1) dat. ἀνάγκη, 31 times (*Od.* 19, *Il.* 12), always at a line end except in I 429, 692; (2) ὑπ' ἀνάγκης, replacing ἀνάγκη, 3 times (*Od.* only); (3) ἀνάγκη, 6 times (*Od.* 1, *Il.* 5). I define -αγκη by 'bond,' whence 'constraint.' The most original contexts are (1) Σ 113 (= T 66) δαμάσαντες ἀνάγκη (see σ 76, below); cf. T 143 ἀναγκαίηφι δαμέντας; (2) ἦ μιν ἀνάγκη | ἴσχει, δ 557, ε 14, ρ 143 (of *Kalypso*); (3) locutions with ἄγω, to wit:

ι 98, τοὺς μὲν ἐγὼν ἐπὶ νῆας ἄγον κλαίοντας ἀνάγκη  
 ξ 27, σὺν ἀγέμειν μνηστήρσιν ὑπερφιάλοισιν ἀνάγκη  
 ξ 272 (= ρ 44), τοὺς δ' ἄναγον ζωοὺς σφισὶν ἐργάζεσθαι ἀνάγκη  
 σ 76, . . . ἄγον ἴώσαντες ἀνάγκη | δευδιότα  
 χ 353, ἀλλὰ πολὺ πλέονες καὶ κρείσσονες ἦγον ἀνάγκη  
 I 429 (= 692), ἀνάγκη δ' οὐ τί μιν ἄξω (ἄξει).

—Of the six instances of ἀνάγκη (nom.) two might be replaced by ἀνάγκη, if = ἐν ἄγκη,<sup>1</sup> viz.: E 633, τίς τοι ἀνάγκη | πτώσειν ἐνθάδ', which is later in type (as τίς shows) than T 251, ἀλλὰ τί ἦ ἔριδας καὶ νείκεα νῶιν ἀνάγκη | νεικεῖν ἀλλήλοισιν ἐναντίον; (see § 17, fn. for *necesse est*).

44. What is the form \*ἄγκη? I derive it from *ñkã*, a long nasal vowel grade of *nēk̃*- (see § 17 6°, above), or from *ñkã*: the root as written *enek̃*- (§§ 35–36).<sup>2</sup> With *ñkã*, the Celtic base

<sup>1</sup> Lysias (as cited above, § 17) in his ἐν ἀνάγκη ἐστὶ realizes afresh my theoretical restoration of \*ἐν ἄγκη.

<sup>2</sup> Hirt, *Abl.* 628, gives identical reduction of *enk̃* and *ñk̃* to *ak* in Greek, and so in all other I.-E. languages. Then we may as well suppress the theoretical *ñk̃*-stage altogether. But the *a* of ἐν-άγκη may be a sporadic example of the true phonetic development of *ñ*.

*enknā* (so Fick-Stokes, p. 32; earlier *ḡknā-*), whence O Ir. *ecen*, is the nearest correlative.

45. For the meaning of the word \**ἄγκη* we should note *δμῶες ἀναγκαῖοι* (ω 210) = 'servi vincti,' *χρειοὶ ἀναγκαῖη* (Θ 57) = 'necessitate vinciente' and *ἡμᾶρ ἀναγκαῖον* (Π 836) = 'dies vinciens.' For further cognates see § 17, and for a discussion of Lat. *necesse*, like \**ἐν ἄγκη* a locative, = 'in bonds,' see *TAPA*. 37, 9 seq. Unless we suppose that *necessarii* 'coniuncti, affines' and *necessitudo* 'coniunctio, affinitas' came into Latin by translation from *ἀναγκαῖοι* — and this seems to me a very unlikely assumption — we cannot cling, not even for the sake of the hoary mother-in-law joke, to the definition of *necessarius* as 'unavoidable.' I have pointed out (l.s.c.) that the Horatian *Necessitas* was the "Binder," equipped with all the tools for binding. In Greek the following examples are especially apposite, Aeschylus, *Prom.* 108, *ἀνάγκαις ταῖσδ' ἐνέξενυμαι τάλας*; Soph. *Ph.* 1025, *ἀνάγκη ζυγείς*; *Aj.* 944 (cf. Eur. *Or.* 1330) *ἀνάγκης ζυγόν*; Eur. *I.A.* 443, *ζεύγματ' ἀνάγκης*. For further illustration of our semantic problem I address myself to the study of the relation between

viii. Eng. *thong* : Av. *θang-* 'ziehen'

46. If these words are cognate, their root, as older Eng. *thwong* shows, must have been *tweng(h)*. Their meaning invites identification, cf. Eng. *tug* 'strap, trace, thong': Lat. *ducit* 'zieht.' In Avestan, *tweng(h)* would yield *θwang-*, but the by-form *teng(h)* would yield *tang-*, and *θang*<sup>1</sup> is due to a confusion of the two. A cognate root with *k* is represented in Skr. *tanākti*, with a by-form (grammatical) *tvanākti* 'zusammenzieht, coagulates.' A further cognate in O Bulg. *tegnati* 'ziehen' (see Zupitza, *BB.* 25, 89, who unnecessarily writes the root as *theng-*). The direct sense of 'bind' is well attested in Slavic forms (see Miklosich, *Wtbch.*, p. 350).

47. The root *twengh* seems to me a clear compound of a preposition *tu* + the root *enġh* in its prepalatal stage (§§ 10, 15). And what is the preposition *tu-*? It is found alive in

<sup>1</sup> Unless *w* was lost by dissimilation in *θ[w]anwarē* 'bow.'



Ir. *to* 'ad' and, as Bugge<sup>2</sup> has seen, in Goth. *du*, from \**θu-* in enclitic relation to its noun.<sup>1</sup> As for the vocalism of *tu-*, a reference to ἀπύ and πρυ- (v. Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*<sup>3</sup> § 9, anm.) puts us on the track. In these forms we have pre-Greek *u*, apparently, and may attribute the same *o/u* alternation to the preverb *to-/tu-*. In view of Eng. "to and fro" and "to and from" the combinations "*tuk<sup>we</sup> apuk<sup>we</sup>*" and "*tuk<sup>we</sup> pruk<sup>we</sup>*" may be restored, cf. Av. *āča parača* 'to and fro,' Lat. *susque deque* and *reciprocus*, developed from a hypostatic *requeproque*, whence, by normal phonetic development (-*co-*, whence *ci*, from -*que-* before *p-c*) *reciproc(o)-s* (Fay, *AJP.* 31, 414).

47a. Cognate with *thong* is Germ. *zwang* quasi 'ἀνάγκη, necessitas,' and this is as aptly illustrative of the sense of *necessitas* (when = 'relation, tie'), as of ἀνάγκη.

ix. Lat. *iuvenis*, *iuvencus*, *iuvo*

48. The words *iuvenis* and *iuvencus* belong to a multitudinous sept, but I know of no etymology for them. I propose to connect them with the root of Skr. *yāuti* 'jungit.' I take it that the *iuvenes* were the 'coniuncti' of a household, the members of the *band* of a pater familias, cf. Skr. *bāndhu-s* 'amicus, angehöriger' and, collectively, 'genossenschaft.' The connotation 'young' had been established, of course, before the break-up of the Indo-European race. One may wonder whether the Roman connotation of 'soldier boy' (in *iuvenis* and *iuventus*) may be an inheritance. But the sense of *iuvenis* may have been derived as in Lat. *pignera* glossed by *filii* (*pignus* : *pangit*, with Bréal and with Niedermann ap. Walde, s.v.; from a root *pē(y)-ng-*, see § 23 fn.), cf. Skr. *bandhā-s* 'pignus' (*PW.*<sup>2</sup>, 13) : *bandhula-s* 'bastard,' cf. *vóthos* 'bastard' : the root *ne-dh-* (Fay, *Cl. Rev.* 13, 400), and Skr. *sūnú-s* 'son' : *sūná* 'woven basket,' *sūtra-* 'yarn.'

<sup>1</sup> I think with Bugge (*PBB.* 12, 399 sq.) that we may reckon with proclisis in German as well as in Irish, and as Irish *to* proclitically became *do*, I infer that Germanic *þu* < (or, with Bugge, *þu* — <) became *du-*. I am aware that the explanation is merely *ad hoc*, and begs the question, but it does apply a known principle of explanation (see § 42), and prepositions meaning 'apud, ad' are wont to be toneless, e.g. -*ðe* and Av. -*da*, Umbr. -*co(m)*.

48a. For *iuvencus* 'bullock' : Skr. *yuvaçá-s* 'iuvenis,' start-form *yu-wñko-s* (or better *zuwñko-s*, Fay, *AJP.* 25, 163), instead of the current explanation by a suffix *-ñko-*, I am disposed to set up the division *zu-w-ñkó-s*, tautological like Skr. *bandhu-pāçá-s* 'fetter' (*AV.*) or Ger. *bandnerve* "'tendo,' was sonst band allein ausdrückt." Whether we start with 'bullock' or 'youth,' the definition 'bändig'<sup>1</sup> (= 'qui vinculo paret, qui domatur,' Grimm) is apposite.

49. With the cognation of Lat. *iuvat* 'helps' and Skr. *yuyóti* 'separates' I am but half satisfied, for *yuyóti* is nothing but *yāúti* 'iungit,' with a meaning given to it by separative prepositions, cf. Ger. *ab-spannen*, *aus-spannen*, generalized to 'loose' from 'unhitch,' and above all ἀποζεύγνυται, διαζεύγνυται = 'separatur, liberatur.' In Lithuanian, *veriù* = both 'claudio' and 'recludo.' In combination with a separative case the simplex *yāúti* would also tend to mean 'ties, hinders, separates from.' It was possible, by allocation of the flexional type *yuyóti* to the sense 'separat' and of *yāúti* to the sense 'conjungit,' to secure perfect clearness, but cf. Ger. *aufbinden* ap. Grimm, *Wibch.* 3: "der zusammenhang hat zu entscheiden ob 'ein mädchen mit aufgebundnem haar' ausdrücke mit zierlich aufgeputztem oder mit frei und losfliegendem." It is from the sense of 'iungit' that Lat. *iuvat* 'helps' derives, and along the simplest lines. If we note the generalization of Skr. *yuñj-* and of *yu-* (both nouns found in a Veda [MS.] which has preserved words of proethnic stock not elsewhere extant in Sanskrit) 'comes,' an example like *(hac re) me adiutamini* (mid.) lends itself to conception as "companion me in this," whence, by natural inference, 'help me.' But *hoc me adiutamini* might mean 'join this with me,' and the *me* was instrumental, misunderstood as accusative. It is curious how the etymological sense may be restored to a Gellian archaism (2, 29, 7) which, in point of construction, stands quite alone, (ut) messim hanc nobis adiuvent = 'to bind up this crop with us.' The sense 'it delights me' (*me iuvat*), whether of special Latin origin or not, is comparable with Skr. *yuñjāna-s* 'dem es wohlgeht' (*PW.*<sup>2</sup> 16), *yukta-m* "günstig" (*ib.* 17 p.).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Aratus, cited in § 19, fn.

x. Gr. ἔσχατος : Lat. *angulus* ; ὄχθουβος

50. Of ἔσχατος we possess a gratifying amount of knowledge. We know that its startform was *eghs* + a termination also found in ἔγ-κατ-α 'the inwards.' A definition of κατ- is missing. I derive it from the root *kē(y)*- 'iacēre,' whose long vocalism may be inferred from Skr. -*çī-* 'lying,' -*çīma-*, -*çītha-s*, cf. *çāy-in* 'lying' and Homeric κῶμα 'sopor.' Bartholomae writes the Avestan root as *sāy-* and the p. ptc. *sita-* may derive either from *-kē-to-* or from *-kī-to-*. In *κείμεναι*, derivation from *kēymēi* is possible, and Skr. *çāyate* may be from *kāyē-*, with secondary accent, cf. inf. *çayādhyāi* (RV.) and *çayātha* 'lair.' Thus analyzed ἔσχατος, i.e. *eghs-kēto-s*, = 'outlying,' a rendering actually found in L. & Sc.

51. This raises the question of the etymology of *eghs* 'out,' and if one will study the Homeric examples, including ἔσχατίν and ἔσχατόων, the definition 'grenz-liegend' for ἔσχατος can hardly fail to suggest itself, being especially pat for the Thracians, on the outskirts of the Trojan forces, K 434. In other connections ἔσχατοι = 'borderers.' Thus *egh(e)s-* 'binding, border, boundary' admits of being derived from the root *egh-* (§§ 15, 3°; 29) 'iungere.' We may somewhat specifically compare O Bulg. *granica* 'grenze' : *granī* 'ecke, corner,' and ask if \**eghes-* meant 'corner.' In this case Lat. *angulus* is an ultimate cognate, from the root *e-negh-* (see §§ 36, 44, fn.) as ἀγκύλη ('band, loop, thong, bend of the arm') is from the root *e-nek-*. For the notion of 'bend' is, I infer, as in English, derived from the notion of 'bind,' and as we account for Eng. *bend* from the act of 'binding the bow,' so we may account for the development of the Skr. verb *āñcati* 'bends' from a prepalatal form of the root *e-nek-* 'binds.' As to the vocalism of the root, ἄγκιστρον 'hook' (ἀγκ- as in ἀν-άγκη, § 44, fn.), Lat. *ancus* 'qui aduncum brachium habet' : Lat. *uncus*, ὄγκος 'barb' are important evidences for *enek-*. An interesting specialization of meaning is found in Indo-Iranian \**anḱu-* 'stalk' (of the Soma plant), cf. Eng. 'joint' (of grass or of a cane), and Skr. *bāndhana-m* "stiel (einer frucht, einer blüthe)". I also explain *iuncus* as a tautological compound

from *yū-* + *-nko-s*, quasi 'tie-binder' (pace Fick-Stokes, p. 223; Mod. Ir. *aoín* 'joint-grass' ('bent')) will be due to some foreign influence, as of Eng. *joint* or Fr. *joindre*).

52. With \**eghes-* 'border' I connect Homeric *ῥχθη* 'bank, dyke' (natural or artificial), with meaning as in Skr. *bān-dhana-m* 'eindämmen, damm.' The sense of 'border' is clear in the compound *ῥχθου-βος* = 'on-border-strap' (*-βος* from *-gʷos* as in Lat. *boves* 'straps,' see § 27): note the instructive variants *ῥκθιβος* and *ῥκθροιβος* (Schmidt, Hesychius, ed. min.<sup>2</sup> p. 490, no. 1400, fn.), in which *ῥκθι-* is a locative, doing duty for *ῥκτοθι* (cf. the dialectal pair *ἐκτός* : *ῥχθός*), and *ῥκθροι-* is a locative of *ῥχθρο-*: Lat. *exterus* (see Fay, *AJP.* 31, 420). These variants are popular attempts to restore the subconscious and nearly vanished feeling for *ῥχθου-βος* 'border-stripe.'<sup>1</sup>

xi. *ῥγχνη* and other words meaning 'pear'

53. Schrader in his *Reallexikon*, s.v. *Birne*, very properly connects with *ῥγχνη* the words *ἄχρᾰς* and *ἄχερδος*, the latter a thorny wild pear tree used for hedges (*Odys.*). He also makes the entirely unsupported suggestion that the *ῥγγος* (= 'pike') was made of pear-wood, whereas the *ἄχερδος* is vastly more likely to have been named from its 'spikes.' It is, however, from the sense of 'binding' and to the root *e-neǵh-*, so widely studied above, that these names of the pear are to be referred. By turning up the references cited in L. Meyer's lexicon (I, pp. 148, 151), and especially the scholia to Aris- tophanes, *Eccl.* 351-355, the 'binding,' i.e. 'astringent, consti-

<sup>1</sup> It would certainly be curious if the name of the several 'fastening' devices in *-βος* included in a group collected by Sturtevant in *CP.* 5, 340 did not exhibit in *-βος* the word for a 'cowhide strap,' and above all Hesiodic *μέσαβον* 'yoke-thong,' or rather 'mid-strap,' cf. the variant *μεσάτιον* (in the technological writer, Pollux), an *ivo* derivative of *μέσ(σ)ατος* 'middlemost,' whence *μεσα-* in *μέσαβον*. Pollux also gives *μεσθ-βοιον*, in which *-βοιον*, from *gʷouyom*: Skr. *gāvya-m* 'ner-vus' (i.e. bowstring, lexical), seems rather clear, in view of Plautine *boiae*, a loan word from *-βοιον*, not *-βοεία*. It surely does not militate against this that the *boiae* came to be made of wood or iron (pace Solmsen, *KZ.* 37, 24; Sommer ap. Walde, s.v. *bōj-a*): are not "ties" on railroads made of wood, and about cotton bales of iron? Cf. the *κυνέη πάγχαλκος*. Further note *βο(ν)α* = strap-snake(?), and see on *schlange*, § 27 and fn.

pating' character ascribed to the *ἄχρας* sept must strike any reader, as it surprised me when I asked myself whether there could be a possible connection between *ὄγχυνη*, later *ὄχνη*, and the root *e-neġh-*. Morphologically, it is of interest to note in these words the variation of *n* and *r* stems, and the double weakening in *ἄχ-ρά-δ-* as compared with *ἄχ-ερ-δο-* — which admit of analysis as 'constrictionem-dans.'<sup>1</sup>

54. It remains to speak a word on the later Greek form *ὄχνη* (Theocritus), with dissimilative (?) loss of *γ* from *ὄγχνη*. This may show us how, in our primitive speech, the *n* of *engh-* came to be lost, yielding a "root" *egh-*. So *ὄκνος*, the rope-binder of Polygnotos, may have first been named \**Ὀγκνος*, *i.e.* 'nexor': the root *e-neġh-*; *ὄκνος* 'sluggishness' would then have had the development of sense found in *piger*, *νωχελής* (§ 16, 1°).

VI. Skr. *āndhas-* (1) SOMA-PLANT, (2) DARKNESS. O Bulg. *j-agnedŭ* 'POPLAR'

55. As Skr. *amñś-s* 'soma-stalk' (§ 51) may be derived from *nkñ-s* : *eneġ-* 'vincire,' so *andhas-* : *ἄνθος* 'plant, flower' (for *a-* see § 44, fn.) may be derived from *ndhes-* 'binding.' From the same root *enedh-* 'to bind,' passing to the senses of 'to blindfold, cover' (cf. Gallic *anda-bata* 'blindfold-fighter'), *āndhas-* 'darkness' may come. From the root *ened(h)-* we also have Skr. *andū-s* 'fusskette' (startform *ndu-*): Lat. *ānus* 'fetter' (Plautus), if for *annus* (startform *ndno-s*). Irish *ānne*, glossed by 'anellus' may owe its apex, particularly as gen. *ainne* occurs in a text without an apex, to the glossist's feeling for *ānus*.<sup>2</sup> Then *anne* is from *ndniā* rather than from *a(n)knīā*

<sup>1</sup> So *ἄπιος* : Lat. *pīrus* will mean (arbor or fructus) 'constringens,' and belong with *apere* 'to bind' and with *apis* 'bee,' the 'joiner,' the 'carpenter-bee,' to wit. Here also Lat. *apīum* 'parsley,' used for binding into chaplets. The Greek *ἄπιος*, a sort of Euphorbia, was also called *ἰσχας*, and had a leaf like the *πήγανον* (= 'rue'); *ἰσχάς* can hardly have meant anything but 'holding' (from 'binding,' cf. *ὄχανον*, § 16, 4°), and the same definition suits *πήγανον*, unless that meant 'binding-plant,' *i.e.* 'border plant' (cf. *οὐδ' ἐν σελίνῳ οὐδ' ἐν πήγανῳ* = 'not on the border').

<sup>2</sup> Whether vacillations like *rān* | *rann* | *rainn* (see Thurneysen, *air. Gram.* § 43) furnish other evidence for original *ā* I cannot judge.

(so Fick-Stokes, p. 16). I also see noun stems from the root *ened(h)*- 'vincire' in the following compounds, names of plants, O Bulg. *j-agn-ëndü* 'felloe-tree' (see § 39, fn.), Skr. *aru-ndh-atī* 'schling-pflanze,' Lat. *aru-ndo* 'joint-plant' (also used of limed twigs and wreaths). In the last two compounds *aru-* will belong with the root of ἀρρίσκει 'joins.'